

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/811,980	03/30/2004	Yoshinobu Hirokado	2257-0246PUS1	3134
2292 7590 10/18/2007 BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747			EXAMINER	
			HO, ALLEN C	
FALLS CHUR	.CH, VA 22040-0747	1747 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
			2882	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
	•		10/18/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/811,980	HIROKADO, YOSHINOBU			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Allen C. Ho	2882			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
A SH WHI(- Exte	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA Insigns of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATIO 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ti	N. mely filed			
- Failu Any	Diperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period ware to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	cause the application to become ABANDONI	ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 Se	eptember 2007.				
,—	This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.					
3)	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims					
4)⊠	Claim(s) 3,9,10 and 18 is/are pending in the ap	pplication.				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)🖂	5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>3,10 and 18</u> is/are allowed.					
,	Claim(s) 9 is/are rejected.					
•	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		· ·			
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.	1			
Applicat	ion Papers		•			
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	r. ·				
10)⊠	The drawing(s) filed on 30 March 2004 is/are: a	a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected t	to by the Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	e Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	n)-(d) or (f).			
a)	a)⊠ All b)□ Some c)□ None of: 1.⊠ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
		•				
			• •			
Attachmer	nt(s)					
1) Notic	ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary				
· <u>-</u>	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I				
	er No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	E-France and a			

Art Unit: 2882

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi et al. (U. S. Patent No. 5,955,850) in view of Kawate et al. (U. S. Patent No. 7,012,362 B2).

With regard to claim 9, Yamaguchi et al. disclosed a cold cathode light emitting device that comprises: a plurality of cathode electrodes (2, 102); a plurality of insulating layers (3, 3', 103, 103') laminated over the plurality of cathode electrodes; a plurality of gate electrodes (7) provided on the plurality of insulating layers to intersect the plurality of cathode electrodes with the plurality of insulating layers interposed therebetween for extracting electrons from the plurality of cathode electrodes; an anode electrode (9, 109) opposed to the plurality of gate electrodes for emitting light upon receipt of the electrons, with a voltage for accelerating the electrons being applied between the anode electrode and the plurality of cathode electrodes; at least one hole (20, 120) provided at each intersection of the plurality of cathode electrodes and the plurality of gate electrodes extending through the plurality of gate electrodes and the plurality of insulating layers to reach a surface of the plurality of cathode electrodes, the at least one hole having a first diameter (D1) at a position where a first (3, 103) of the plurality of insulating layers contact the plurality of cathode electrodes and a second diameter (2d1, D2) at a position of

Art Unit: 2882

the plurality of gate electrodes, where the second diameter is greater than the first diameter (Figs. 3, 22).

However, Yamaguchi et al. failed to disclose a nanofiber-structure layer provided on the plurality of first electrodes in an opening portion corresponding to the first diameter in the at least one hole.

Kawate *et al.* disclosed a cold cathode light emitting device that comprises a nanofiber-structure layer provided on the plurality of first electrodes. Kawate *et al.* taught that nanofiber is capable of emitting a high electron current at a low electric field (column 11, lines 32-57).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a nanofiber-structure layer on the plurality of first electrodes in an opening portion corresponding to the first diameter in the at least one hole, since a person would be motivated to employ an electron emission material that is capable of emitting a high electron current at a low electric field.

Furthermore, although Yamaguchi et al. disclosed a thickness t1 (L₁) of a lowermost insulating layer of the plurality of insulating layers being in contact with the plurality of cathode electrodes and a thickness t2 (L₂) of the remainder of the plurality of insulating layers (column 7, lines 38-41), Yamaguchi et al. failed to disclose a t1 that is smaller than t2. Yamaguchi et al. further taught designing an electric field by adjusting various parameters (column 7, line 65 - column 8, line 9).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure the thickness of the lowermost insulating layer such that it is

Art Unit: 2882

smaller than the thickness of the remainder of the plurality of insulating layers, since a person would be motivated to design a desired electric field by adjusting various parameters.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 3, 10, and 18 are allowed.

Response to Amendment

4. Applicant's arguments filed 28 September 2007 with respect to claims 3, 9, and 10 have been fully considered. The objection of claims 3, 9, and 10 has been withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed 28 September 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to the rejection of claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaguchi et al. (U. S. Patent No. 5,955,850) in view of Kawate et al. (U. S. Patent No. 7,012,362 B2), the applicant argues that Yamaguchi et al. and Kawate et al. failed to disclose a lowermost insulating layer of the plurality of insulating layers being in contact with the plurality of cathode electrode has a thickness t1, and the remainder of the plurality of insulating layers other than the lowermost insulating layer has a thickness t2 > t1. Specifically, the applicant argues that the greater thickness of the insulating layer located adjacent to the gate electrodes is used to perform the function of ensuring insulation between the gate electrodes, the cathode electrodes, and a nanofiber-structure layer. This argument is not persuasive. First of all, this

Art Unit: 2882

argument is not applicable to the cold cathode light emitting device disclosed by Yamaguchi et al. since this argument is based on applicant's own invention. Yamaguchi et al. suggested that various parameters could be adjusted to design a desired electric field (column 7, line 65 - column 8, line 9). Furthermore, the rejection clearly sets forth a rationale for modifying the thicknesses. It would be within the capabilities of a person skilled in the art to adjust various parameters to design a desired electric field. Using a known technique to achieve a predictable result would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 82 USPO2d 1385 (U.S. 2007).

Therefore, the rejection is being maintained.

Conclusion

6. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2882

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Allen C. Ho whose telephone number is (571) 272-2491. The

examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 9:00 am - 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Edward J. Glick can be reached on (571) 272-2490. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Allen C. Ho/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 2882

11 October 2007